THE

"HINDU MESSAGE"

A Weekly Review of Indian and World-Problems from the Hindu Standpoint.

Editors: K. Sundararama Aiyar M.A., & T. K. Balasubrahmanya Aiyar B.A.

VOL. 2.] THURSDAY SEPTEMBER 19, 1918. [No. 22.

The **Hindu Message** stands for

(1) The Maintenance of British supremacy with self-government for India,

(2) Co-operation with the different communities of India without prejudice to Hindu Dharma,

(3) Education of the Hindus as an integral part of the Indian Nation,

(4) Advancement of Material prosperity on a spiritual basis and

(5) Dissemination of pure Hindu Culture.

Annual Subscription Rs. 6 only.
For *bona fide* students Rs. 3 only.
Single copy As. 2 only.

All business communications and remittances to be addressed to the Manager and all literary contributions and books for Review to be addressed to the Editor, THE HINDU MESSAGE, *Srirangam.*

A Vision Of India.

KAVERI—VIII.

By K. S. Ramaswami Sastri, B.A., B.L.

Fair Chandrakantha's sinful soul and frame
Were sinless made by thy pure waters sweet
And thus escaped the Power whose righteous feet
Did wait to push her to the bath of flame,
Though she in guilty joy a life of shame
Had lived in realms where pleasure's eager feet
Do roam beneath the warmth of Passion's heat,
By thy sweet gracious touch she pure became.
And Arjuna, the soul of righteousness,
The playmate of the Lord, the man of might
Whose deeds have won the world's ungrudging praise,
A pilgrim came to where thy waters bless
Our holy land and won Subhadra bright
As queen as fruit of thy exceeding grace.

The Hindu Message

THURSDAY EVENING 19, SEPT., 1918.

The Special Congress.

Nothing can be more absurd than to suppose that the special Congress was convened either to reject the Montagu-Chelmsford scheme or to drive the so-called Moderates from "their place in the Sun". There are lots of men in India who think that either they must be the foremost among its men of leading, or they would set up a party of Adullamites. The return of Mr. Tilak to the Congress platform, and the intrusion of new and vigorous personalities into the arena of politics so as to oust from their place of pre-eminence men of egotistic proclivities who are assured of their own descent from heaven,—both these circumstances combined with the natural desire in many Indians to agree quickly with the Government side as the one most likely to win and that from which personal favours of one kind or another can be expected as the reward of support given, have brought several into the ranks of the adullamites of India who are miscalled Moderates. Of course, we exclude from this category our great time-worn leader, Babu Surendra Nath Banerjea, who is guided altogether by considerations of a different kind—considerations of fear that even the concession now made might be withdrawn and India's cause will be shelved altogether like that of Ireland. We cannot but respect the man who has borne the brunt of half-a-century of public work and patriotic endeavour and who, at this fag end of a life prolonged beyond the term allotted to those who had been his life-long associates, wishes to witness the fruition, however partial, of his labours before he leaves the scene. There are however, others who have come late into Indian politics more out of the spirit of vain-glory than from a desire to serve the people and who are ever on the look-out for the coign of advantage which will bring their own self-esteemed selves to the front. The so-called Moderates of today are mainly recruited from the ranks of disappointed men of various kinds and egotistic men of small minds who have various personal aims to advance, and hence they are true Adullamites who will soon find the level they deserve in Indian public life. The Congress can afford to go on in the way it has done for more than thirty years past, and it will lose nothing by ignoring them.

We cannot understand why any one should indulge in derision at the Congress, because it has acknowledged the advances in the Montagu-Chelmsford scheme and among them, the principle of reserved and transferred subjects for both the Government of India and the Provinces. The Congress had not made any previous pronouncement hostile to that scheme and thereby disabled itself from making the recognition it has now made in its favour. The Congress as an institution must always be distinguished from individuals who figure prominently within or without it as Indian politicians. It is the failure to make this distinction that has kept out some of these so-called Moderates who are really well-intentioned men from the special Congress. If men like Babu

Surendra Nath Bannerjea had come into the Congress and not kept aloof because of their failure to distinguish the Congress as an institution from the individuals who figure in it, their influence might have helped it a good deal and also added to its influence and prestige on this unique occasion. This was the part played by some of those who also passed as Moderates, and certainly they have served the Congress better than those who have kept aloof either through misapprehensions or from pure egotism impervious to all humanising influences.

We have already briefly referred above to the proposal of the special Congress that the Government of India also should be brought under the operation of the principle which makes a distinction of reserved and transferred subjects. This is one leading merit of the new Congress scheme. Some object to this requirement on the ground that, if reform advances equally both in the Government of India and Provincial Governments, the former will be disabled from "controlling" the latter. The reformed Government of India will have certain matters always under its exclusive control, and certain other matters only for a time. We do not see why it should lose any prestige on account of this circumstance. As for general control, it can always exercise it by suggestion, advice, and influence. A *second* merit of the new Congress scheme over the Montagu-Chelmsford scheme is that it proposes that, "the Budget shall be under the control of the legislature," and that all taxation should be imposed by "the Provincial Government as a whole for both transferred and reserved subjects." The merit of this proposal is that it ensures that the Indian Minister's voice will influence the taxation proposed for the reserved subjects and thus breaks through "the reserve" to the extent of its financial bearings. The *third* point of advance in the New Congress scheme is that it demands that "full responsible government should be established in the whole of British India within a period not exceeding 15 years." No principle can be found for settling a matter like this, and to demand a statement of principle is simply absurd. Some time-limit must be fixed, and fifteen years is as good a limit as any other. The appointment of Committees and Commissions to decide when an advance can be made in the reform of the administration is always apt to engender heat in the public mind. In a country governed from outside and by men who do not belong to any of its indigenous communities, influences of all sorts are apt to prevail in arriving at a determination of the question when a further step can be taken. In order to avoid all uncertainty, suspicion, and discontent, it is necessary that a date be fixed once for all, and we think that the special Congress has shown its wisdom and moderation in fixing the limit of 15 years. When the late Emperor of Japan decided to confer the blessing of popular Government on his people, he decided, too, on fixing a time-limit, and did not appoint a Commission. According to the Montagu-Chelmsford scheme, there are to be two Commissions, one at the end of ten years, and the second after a period of 12 years following the appointment of the first Commission. Whether after these 22 years have passed, India will have attained the

goal of responsible government is a matter left in uncertainty. The popular agitation will have to be kept up till then; and men cannot devote themselves to the various tasks required to enable the Indian people to advance industrially and educationally. If a time-limit is fixed once for all, the people and their leaders will devote their energies in all right directions to prepare the country for undertaking the destiny intended for it. We trust that British statesmen will trust the Indian people, and not leave them to the chances of a settlement which may be based on no principle, or which may be reached by such uncertain or unforeseen stages as will always breed discontent or compel the popular leaders to maintain an agitation for the keeping up of discontent against the Government.

There may be defects in detail in the new scheme now proposed by the Congress, but it is a great improvement on the one contained in the Montagu-Chelmsford report. Moreover, the Congress is not a legislative body, nor has it been asked to prepare a cut and dried scheme. So any defects in its draft scheme may be easily remedied. We do not see why any body of Indians—and especially those who have for years been among its leaders or the rank and file of its supporters—should quarrel with it or form a new organisation. We do not see why Babu Surendra Nath Banerjee should have been at pains to have a resolution passed in favour of of the Government scheme, when the recommendations of the special Congress are available and express the "self-determination" of the Indian people. Babu Surendra Nath Banerjee has, indeed, obtained a "Committee consisting of all the non-official members of the (Imperial) Council to consider the reform report and make recommendations to the Government of India." We shall wait and see what improvements he will obtain for the country in the scheme put forward by the illustrious framers of the Reform Report. We may say at once that we are unable to entertain the hope that he will succeed in his attempt, and we are now without serious apprehensions that some harm will be done. If the result proves that we are taken we shall certainly feel glad. But we know the history "of the party of ascendency" in India. We also know what part it has played in Canada, in Ireland, and in South Africa, and elsewhere. Let us hope that it has learnt better, and that Babu Surendra Nath Banerjee's present trust in it does not prove a fantastic delusion.

The Hon'ble Mr. V. J. Patel's Bill.

A New Peril to Hindu Society.

IV. The Religious Aspect.

One of the great features of modern scholarship is its ability — equalled only by its willingness — to select fragments of authorities and piece them together in such a manner as to support preconceived theories. Another great feature is the ability to juggle with eras and periods and make reconstruction of the past that will enable them to draw the conclusions already settled before-hand. A third great feature is the noble scorn of tradition and the bumptious reliance on one's own power of unerring perception of truth which sometimes lead to startling results and always leads to irreconcileable and diametri-

cally opposite conclusions. Nowhere are all these gifts and graces of modern scholarship exhibited better than in the discussion of the religious texts bearing on the Hindu marriage system.

It was only a few years ago that the Hon'ble Mr. V. S. S. Sastri and others talked learnedly about Srauta Lingas and Smarta Lingas and sought to subvert the Hindu pre-puberty ideals of marriage by dragging even the scriptures to their aid. Some of our pandits, out of motives and considerations which will not bear much examination and scrutiny, lent the help of their scholarship to bring about such a social revolution. Fortunately the solid good sense of the community as a whole and the loyalty of the majority of the learned men to the commandments of the Lord coupled with the strong-minded adhesion of the government to its statesmanlike policy of declared religious neutrality saved the community from what threatened to be an irretrievable catastrophe.

The *Smritikartas* have clearly laid down that the marriage must be within the caste. They have grudgingly allowed *Anuloma* marriages but they tried to weed them out of the social garden by strong and well-merited censure. Their censures bore fruit in course of time and eventually the *Anuloma* marriages went out of existence and were expressly forbidden. As I have already pointed out the dangers of *Varnasankara* are equally great for all castes and will result in the loss of all great family and communal graces and refinements and in a net loss to our society in respect of beauty and power. Our sacred scriptures have always denounced *Pratiloma* marriages and any one who denies this is either an ignorant or a wilful misinterpreter and perverter of our scriptures.

It will not be possible to go in detail here into all the injunctions contained in our Smritis on this matter. We shall refer here to a few texts. Manu says:

सवर्णाग्रे द्विजातीनां प्रशस्ता दारकर्मणि ।
कामतस्तु प्रवृत्तानां इमाः स्युः क्रमशो वराः ॥

शूद्रैव भार्या शूद्रस्य सा च स्वा च विशः स्मृते ।
ते च स्वा चैव राज्ञस्य ताश्च स्वा चाग्रजन्मनः ॥

न ब्राह्मणक्षत्रिययोरापद्यपि हि तिष्ठतोः ।
कस्मिंश्चिदपि वृत्तान्ते शूद्रा भार्योपदिश्यते ॥

हीनजातिस्त्रियं मोहादुद्वहन्तो द्विजातयः ।
कुलान्येव नयन्त्याशु ससन्तानानि शूद्रताम् ॥

शूद्रां शयनमारोप्य ब्राह्मणो यात्यधोगतिम् ।
जनयित्वा सुतं तस्यां ब्राह्मण्यादेव हीयते ॥

दैवपित्र्यातिथेयानि तत्प्रधानानि यस्य तु ।
नाश्नन्ति पितृदेवास्तन्न च स्वर्गं स गच्छति ॥

वृषलीफेनपीतस्य निःश्वासोपहतस्य च ।
तस्यां चैव प्रसूतस्य निष्कृतिर्न विधीयते ॥

(III. Verses. 12—15 & 17—19)

In these stanzas he says that marriages should be within the caste, that *Anuloma* marriages are allowable but are improper, and that the persons committing such transgressions and their issue generate disastrous consequences to the past, the present, and the future generations. Manu says further that the inheritance should be divided in certain proportions among the descendants of such allowed but censured mixed unions. This does not in any way lessen or mitigate the weight of his censure. He says:

अनिन्दितैः स्त्रीविवाहैरनिन्द्या भवति प्रजा ।
निन्दितैर्निन्दिता नृणां तस्मान्निन्द्यान्विवर्जयेत ॥

कुविवाहैः क्रियालोपैर्वेदानध्ययनेन च ।
कुलान्यकुलतां यान्ति ब्राह्मणातिक्रमेण च ॥

(III—42 and 63).

Yajnavalkya says :

एतैरेव गुणैर्युक्तः सवर्णः श्रोत्रियो वरः ।
यत्नात्परीक्षितः पुंस्त्वे युवा धीमान् जनप्रियः ॥
यदुच्यते द्विजातीनां शूद्राद्दारोपसंग्रहः ।
नैतन्मम मतं यस्मात्तत्रायं जायते स्वयम् ॥
तिस्रो वर्णानुपूर्व्येण द्वे तथैका यथाक्रमम् ।
ब्राह्मणक्षत्रियविशां भार्या स्वा शूद्रजन्मनः ॥

(Acharadhyaya, verses 55—57).

We may make a cursory reference here to other Shastraic passages bearing on the question. Baudhayana says that "the wise declare those sprung from an intermixture of the castes to be *Vrâtyas*." (Sacred Books of the East Vol. 14, page 198.) Gautama also holds the same view. Daksha, Vasishtha, Sankha and Vyasa allow only *Anuloma* marriages and even these within limits and they expressly prohibit Pratiloma marriages (see Sacred Books of the East Vol. 2, pp. 195, 196 and 197; Vol. 14, pages 5 & 6; Dutt's Dharma Sastras pages 451, 616, 617, 509. Apastambha prohibits even *Anuloma* marriages and says that marriages must be strictly within the caste (see Sacred Books of the East Vol. 2, pages 130 & 131). Samvarta and Usanas lay down the law in equally clear and strong terms (see Dutt's Dharma Sastras pages 337 & 260). Narada and Brihaspati forbid *Pratilôma* marriages and censure *Anuloma* marriages (Sacred Books of the East Vol. 33 pages 165 and 166). Vishnu also lays down the law in the same terms. (See Sacred Books of the East Vol. 7, pp. 70 to 73). Among the commentators we may point out that Vaidyanatha Dikshita says in his Smriti Muktaphala that *Âsavarna* marriages are utterly prohibited in this Yuga. (See page 231 of the Kumbhakonam Edition). The same declaration of law is made in Raghunandana's *Udvâhatatwa*, in Kamalakara's *Nirnaya Sindhu*, and in the *Parasara Madhaviya*.

Such is the state of the Smriti law on the point. If all this is to be lightly set aside and our scriptural authorities are to be thrown overboard, how are our new legislators going to legislate in regard to the various religious ceremonies to be performed during life and after death? I suppose they will inaugurate further measures of legislation about this matter after driving the thin end of the wedge in the shape of the Inter-caste marriage Bill. How are they going to regulate the distribution of the inheritance among the children of mixed unions? If a Brahmin marries a Brahmin wife and a Sudra wife and has sons by both of them, will they legislate about giving shares equally to them? Perhaps they will legislate that the son by a wife of another caste should get a larger share so that by this means mixed marriages may become popular and the goal of a homogeneous society may be attained. A thousand complications are sure to arise but perhaps Mr. Patel and his friends hope to be able to rise equal to all emergencies and complete their self-imposed task of hammering the Hindu society out of shape.

Let us now for a moment turn our eyes from the families to the religious institutions of the land. Suppose a Brahmin marries a Sudra lady and begets offspring by her. Under the

new law prayed for his sons will inherit all his rights. If he was a temple *archaka,* they would step into his place on his death, and the Courts of Justice are bound to protect him in the enjoyment of those rights. While we are fighting against tremendous odds in the matter of purifying our temples in various respects, new difficulties will thus crop up in the future and make our efforts fruitless in every way. Indeed the old life will disappear in all its manifoldness before the advancing forces of the new legislative generalissimo and Hindu society will very soon be legislated out of existence.

More than anything else Arjuna has condemned *Varna Sankara* in the *Gita* in unmeasured terms and the Lord has accepted his views and stated that the original fourfold division was of his creation. The Hon'ble Mr. V. J. Patel wants us to forget what the Lord has taught us. He wants a legislative declaration that a Hindu committing a gross offence against the Hindu sacred law shall be recognised by the British Government as a Hindu. But his Bill is an outrage on our religion and no one can view with the slightest favour his determined attempt to overthrow our cherished social and religious ideals and legislate out of existence a great society that has been always loyal to the commandments of the Lord.

THE HINDU MESSAGE will be posted regularly every week to any address in India, Burma and Ceylon on payment of Rs. 6 only per annum; For all foreign countries within the Postal Union it will be despatched on payment of 10s. 6d. per annum. All subscriptions are payable in advance and should be remitted to the Manager, "*The Hindu Message*", Srirangam.

Notes and Comments.

Some of our *novi homines* delude themselves into believing that in the West girls love, and then marry whom they love. They consider that love is a sure indication to them to choose their heaven-appointed husbands. Love is certainly a strong and permanent emotion, and not a mere passing flutter of the emotions. It has been truly defined by Indian sages as "the highest form of devotion or attachment." (अनुराग) Such a feeling can only be *developed* slowly, and often the knowledge that one is not only the chosen of the other, but is indispensable to the other and by the other, plays an important part in its development. It is certain that a mere momentary rush of emotional excitement cannot be called love. Hence it is that often in Western stories we find that a girl thinks she loves a man and even accepts a proposal of marriage, but subsequently discovers her mistake and is induced either to abandon her affianced or marries in haste and repents at leisure. In India, love grows as the most pleasure-giving and elevating by-product of marriage, and sweetens by its graces and joys the entire course of married life. Let not our new men make the mistake of giving up the assured joys of the Indian system for the uncertain and unknown fruits of an alien one.

*
* *

We often also read in Western stories of girls to whom men who are already married make love and who, when they have returned it and are in high hopes of having the Elysian future they dream of, discover to their life-long chagrin and misery that their lovers are already married. The women who are already married have their own miseries and troubles, too, which can more easily be imagined than described. In one of the recent Monthly Magazines, there is a story which records this phase of the Western system of marriage. The woman who loves and the woman to whom her lover is already married meet under circumstances of a kind which is painful and humiliating to both. In course of conversation the

former remarks:—"I love him, and he loves me; he is yours by right of marriage; he is mine by right of love." From this, we can easily see how empty is the boast that in the West women marry whom they love.—Distance lends enchantment to the social conditions prevailing in the West. The truth is that all social conditions and systems have their own merits and defects. No system can be perfect, for this is a world of imperfection. In India, the large majority of marriages prove happy, and we should act foolishly if, in attempting to alter the existing system, we only pass from our smaller ills in life to larger evils we know not of.

* * *

If Mr. Patels' Bill passes, it will tend to make our society similar in its marriage system to the society in the West. For, girls educated according to Western standards, some widows, and others whom their parents have for some reason or other not got married before puberty, would be attracted into "loving" rich people belonging to other castes than their own. "Love" marriages would come into fashion, and that would bring in evils like those which we have above noticed, and which are now non-existent in our society. Our *novi homines* can only see dimly into the surface of the alien society which captivates them, And familiarity has blinded them to the merits of their own society and its system of marriage. The future of the Hindu social system is full of uncertainty and danger. We, the conservative section of the Hindu community, throw ourselves entirely on the promise of the British Government to preserve strict neutrality in all religious matters. We think that the granting of permission to introduce this Bill or have it discussed in the Legislative Council of today or the reformed Council of the future is a violation of the pledge which we have always regarded as our Magna Charta.

* * *

We fear that one result of the passing of the Hon'ble Mr. Patel's Bill will be that there will be a large increase of polygamy. Mere curiosity and love of excitement will lead men into marrying a wife in each caste. When men marry in haste and repent at leisure, they will resort to various subterfuges in order to avoid the responsibilities they incur by thoughtless marriages. Moreover, the wives of different casts brought into the same house-hold will destroy domestic peace and happiness. The children will take after the mother's caste, according to the Hindu Smriti and this will lead to trouble, of all kinds, in matters relating to ceremonial inheritance, &c. Besides the Hindus have a contempt for mixed castes, and care must be taken that the issue of mixed marriages do not form mixed castes or add to the numerous castes and sub-castes now existing.

* * *

We have uniformly found that every attempt to disturb the Hindu social system results in more evil than good. Still, thoughtless men go on causing disturbance in the hope that good will come out of evil. The thoughtlessness of the Hon'ble Mr. Patel surpasses anything within our past experience. His imagination is a fertile one, and has conceived the marvel of achieving complete matrimonial freedom in Hindu society by the passing of a short Bill with a single clause—a feat grander than any yet achieved by any legislator from Manu or Minos downwards. A regular *avatara* among legislators. Let all the Indian poets, dramatists, story-tellers, epic-writers, novelists, historians, &c., of New India go into raptures over this *navavatara* (new incarnation) of the Kali age.

* * *

In her lecture on "The Passing of the Caste System," Mrs. Besant repeats the oft-exploded absurdity that the boy Satyakama Jabala was "an illegetimate lad" or "passed into the Brahmin caste." Long before the Theosophists and other enemies of Hinduism were heard of, and long before controversies about caste came into existence, Sri Sankaracharya expounded the Vedic doctrine as contained in the Upanishads. If our readers will consult his great Bhashya on the Chandogya Upanishad, they will see how absurd are Mrs. Besant's views regarding Satyakama Jabala. The story, as told in the

Upanishad, does not contain a single word which casts a doubt on the legitimacy of Satyakama's birth. The present writer has discussed the story in detail, and proved beyond all possibility of dispute that Satyakama was the son of a chaste Hindu woman, and that he was born a Brahmana boy. But Mrs. Besant cares neither for logic nor for the study of Indian texts, nor for any consistent course of thinking. She must pass from one set of principles to another once in ten years or so, and thus she has both championed and abandoned various causes. It is no wonder that she speaks at random about Satyakama Jabala when she wants to condemn the institution of caste. In one of her early Convention Lectures at Adyar, we remember reading a magnificent eulogy of Sri Sankaracharya as an Indian teacher. We trust that she will find time to dispassionately study both the Upanishad passage itself and Sankara's Commentary on it. Let her not do herself harm by further continuing her misunderstanding of the passage, but find out the truth for herself by consulting the great Indian Oracle and Guru. No cause can be well served by injustice and misrepresentation,—at least no lasting good can be done by these means. Nemesis unfailingly comes in and asserts itself in the most unexpected ways.

* * *

A gentleman in the front rank of Indian culture and public spirit and one gifted with the graces which adorn human life and social intercourse—Mr. C. P. Ramaswami Aiyar,—remarked in the course of a Madras lecture on "The Pursuit of Literature :—" "The quest of what could never be found was emphasised in Sanskrit works. It was the quest of the ultimate beauty and the ultimate morality in the universe which made life what it was and what it ought to be." This *seems* to be something like a condemnation of the Indian Vedanta of the school of Sri Sankaracharya. The report of the lecture is a meagre one. But, if it gives correctly the substance of what the lecturer said, we should like to point out that, according to the Advaita system, the Atman is a सिद्धवस्तु, परिनिष्ठितवस्तु, i. e., an object already in our possession. Hence no search is needed to find it, and hence, also, it cannot be found. It is the self of us all, and so no search for it is needed. But ignorant humanity mistakes the body, the senses, the mind, and even things outside for the Atman or the reality, and is constantly running about madly to find them or to keep them in a sound and perfect condition. If the true self were known, all such search would cease. For the self is the one reality, and every thing else will be known as falsely superimposed on the Self like silver on the mother-of-pearl. Just as the false perception of silver ceases on the discovery of the mother-of-pearl, so the perception of the universe as the real ceases when the Atman or Self is realised as the one only reality. When a lost necklace is being diligently searched after, if a friend informs us that it is on the neck and that we are only under an illusion that it is not there but outside of us, then we give up the search and know the truth. Such is the case with all men who are ignorant of the truth of the Self as taught in the Vedanta Philosophy. To a truly enlightened Vedantin—one who is a *Jnani* and a *Mukta*—the universe ceases to exist, and the Self or Atman is the one Existence which is also of the Nature of Experience (*Anubhava*) and Bliss (*Ananda*). Hence there can be for him no "quest of the ultimate beauty and the ultimate morality in the universe,"—for, the universe does not exist, and therefore also there can be in it neither beauty nor morality, ultimate or proximate.

Olla Podrida.

A notable feature of the times was the fact that the Hon'ble Mr. Jinnah expounded Manu and other Smiriti Kartas in the imperial Legislative Council on the occasion of the introduction of the Hon'ble Mr. V. J. Patel's Bill. We shall very soon have our Mahomedan and Christian brethren also throwing light on the dark places of Hindu Law and usage and help-

ing Hindu society to emerge from barbarism into civilisation.

* * *

Another notable feature is that the reformer members of the Council made a solemn request to the Hon'ble Mr. V. J. Patel to wait for the reformed councils. Why? Do they think that reformed councils are better suited for reform legislation? There is no doubt that reform councils will be used and successfully used to make all sorts of foolish experiments with our social life. Our so-called educated men know nothing of sociology or religion, and while they are timid to the degree of unmanliness in all other matters, they are bold as lions when they attack their own social usages and institutions.

* * *

A simultaneous happy sign of Hindu progress is that Thakur Chandra Varma, President of the Shudhi Sabha, Madras, lectured recently on Vedic Dharma. The veteran Theosophist, T. Ramachandra Row presided. I need hardly say that the President of the Shudhi Sabha is the fittest man to expound Vedic Dharma, because he can by the waving of a magic wand convert a bushman into a follower of the Veda and has established a new industry in a land where new industries are shy to appear—the manufacture of Hindus out of non-Hindus.

* * *

Another expounder of Hindu Dharma has recently appeared in the person of Rao Sahib S. Krishnaswami Iyengar. To him belongs the credit of a new invention in a land devoid of inventive skill. Under the auspices of the Historical Association of the Teacher's College he demonstrated that the coming Kalki Avatara is the dead Yasodharman. He differs—what business have scholars (so-called) except to differ—from Professor Pathak (everybody is a professor in these days) who discovered–I beg his pardon, invented—that the assassinated unspeakable murderer and tyrant Mihiragula was the coming Kalki. Thus these professors are true magicians turning the future into the past by a mere wave of the tongue. One of these days a scholar may stand up and prove that Christ's resurrection was merely the return of Napoleon from St. Helena. I hope that the teachers will duly expound these truths to the new generations of students who will have the misfortune to come under their influence, and will thus duly ensure the future progress of the Hindu Society.

* * *

I have got two news in regard to war conditions. We have had two new phrases given to us by war: *viz.* Liquid front and mustard-gassing. Looting has been going on for a few days past in South India. I have felt a doubt recently and I hope that some one or other will clear it. Why does "loot" ryhme with "shoot," and why do both rhyme with "brute"?

* * *

The Humanitarian Conference has turned out to be a tame affair. It merely wanted a more considerate and human treatment to cattle and to third class passengers in Railways. Why are cattle and third class passengers thus put on the same level? There must be some natural affinity or some real parallelism of position or both. What is it?

SCRUTATOR.

The Bhagavad Gita.

With an English Exposition
By K. S. RAMASWAMI SASTRI, B.A., B.L.
(The substance of the lectures now being delivered at the Students' Sanatana Dharma Sabha, Trichinopoly.)

ADHYAYA II.

क्लैब्यं मा स्म गमः पार्थ नैतत्त्वय्युपपद्यते ।
क्षुद्रं हृदयदौर्बल्यं त्यक्त्वोत्तिष्ठ परंतप ॥ ३ ॥

Do not get into this state of impotence, O Partha. It doth not befit thee. Shake off this low faint-heartedness, and rise, O vanquisher of foes.

NOTES:

1. क्लैब्यं Probably the Lord tells him in a banter that though he assumed the disguise of a eunuch in Virata's court, he must not be a eunuch in fact in the presence of a great crisis.

2. पार्थ Kunti had sent him a message to behave like a true Kshatriya. The word probably refers to it and suggests that he should carry out his mother's command.

3. The Lord refers in this verse to Arjuna's statement. न च शक्नोम्यवस्थातुं भ्रमतीव च मे मनः He asks him to call to mind his prowess which enabled him to vanquish his foes and meet in battle Maheswara Himself.

4. Thus the Lord appeals first to Arjuna's chivalry and prowess, because an appeal to a man's natural inclination is the best means of overcoming a strange temporary depression.

अर्जुन उवाच

कथं भीष्ममहं संख्ये द्रोणं च मधुसूदन ।

इषुभिः प्रतियोत्स्यामि पूजार्हावरिसूदन ॥ ४ ॥

Arjuna said :

How, O Madhusoodana, shall I attack with arrows in battle Bhishma and Drona who are worthy of my worship, Oh Madhusoodana.

NOTES :

1. Here Arjuna states as his strongest ground the sin of attacking those worthy of reverence, and places in the background the doubtfulness of victory in battle, the loss of life's enjoyments through the slaughter of kindred, etc. He thus tried to answer Sri Krishna's appeal to the sentiment of heroism by an appeal to the sentiment of reverence. How shall I, he says, shower arrows on them on whom I should shower the sweetest flowers of reverence and adoration? Is not irreverence for elders a great sin, as is stated in the verse गुरुं हुंकृत्य त्वंकृत्य etc.

गुरूनहत्वा हि महानुभावान्

श्रेयो भोक्तुं भैक्षमपीह लोके ।

हत्वार्थकामांस्तु गुरूनिहैव

भुञ्जीय भोगान् रुधिरप्रदिग्धान् ॥ ५ ॥

It is far better in this world to eat what is got by begging without killing our honoured and high-souled elders. By slaying these elders attached as yet to worldly enjoyments we should taste here alone enjoyments vitiated by the shedding of blood.

NOTES :

1. Arjuna says that wading through slaughter to a throne and shutting the gates of mercy on mankind leads to ill consequences here and hereafter.

2. This verse is an answer to a possible argument that the elders have transgressed their bounds of duty and cannot be treated with the reverence due to them if they were in the right path. It is said in the Ramayana :

गुरोरप्यवलिप्तस्य कार्याकार्यमजानतः ।

उत्पथप्रतिपन्नस्य परित्यागो विधीयते ।

But Arjuna says that by not punishing elders by attack we could ensure enjoyment of a life in heaven whereas by attacking them we get only a bloodstained sovereignty and nothing more.

3. The second half of the stanza deals with an assumed objection. Bhishma had once said that he was fettered to the unjust cause of Duryodhana by being his state servant and accepting remuneration for his service. He had said :

अर्थस्य पुरुषो दासः दासस्त्वर्थो न कस्यचित् ।

इति सत्यं महाराज बद्धोऽस्म्यर्थेन कौरवैः ॥

But Arjuna says that in spite of this the elders were his superiors in every way and should not be attacked by him.

4. Or अर्थकामान् may be taken as qualifying भोगान्. Then the verse will mean, "By slaying these elders, we should taste here alone enjoyments consisting of wealth and pleasure dipped in blood." This interpretation obviates the necessity of giving a reason for calling the elders अर्थकामान् after having described them as महानुभावान् in the first half of the stanza.

5. श्रेयः—This word is used to mean the higher raptures of the spirit as opposed to the lower enjoyments of the senses (प्रेयः) In the Kathopanishad it is stated :

अन्यच्छ्रेयोऽन्यदुतैव प्रेयस्ते उभे नानार्थे पुरुषं सिनीतः । तयोः श्रेय आददानस्य साधुर्भवति हीयतेऽर्थाद्य उ प्रेयो वृणीते ।

श्रेयश्च प्रेयश्च मनुष्यमेतस्तौ संपरीत्य विविनक्ति धीरः ।

श्रेयो हि धीरोऽभिप्रेयसो वृणीते प्रेयो मन्दो योगक्षेमाद्वृणीते ॥

6. हिमद्वानुभावान् explained also as one word.

हिमं जाड्यमपहन्तीति हिमहा आदित्योऽग्निर्वा तस्येव अनुभावः सामर्थ्यं येषां तान् ।

This=whose splendour and glory and power are like those of the Sun.

Dharma—XII.

Last time we saw that to the extent that a knowledge reveals to us the existence of an object in general it is valid. This is explained by the portion of the passage quoted last time *viz.*, "धर्म्यंशे प्रामाण्यात्र" Therefore it is that we hold that the *validity* of a Pramana is स्वत: or "of itself at the outset." Moreover even after we get a "संवादज्ञान" or "corroborative knowledge," the first knowledge remains the same. In other words so far as *validity* is concerned it is the *bodha* or knowledge of the thing that operates and in the corroborative evidence also it is the *knowledge* that makes us understand that there is corroboration. Hence it is clear that *bodha* alone is the determining factor of a *Pramana*. This is put by the mismamsakas thus:—

"सत्यपि संवादे, गुणज्ञाने वा, तावदेव प्रमाणस्य सत्वं, नाधिकं किञ्चित्, अतः किं तदपेक्षया" इति ।

Then what is the special function which the second or the corroborative evidence is supposed to do, which was not done by the first knowledge. The first evidence also generated in our mind a *Bodha* and the same thing was done by the corroborative evidence. Then why should the second knowledge alone be accepted as *valid* while the first is denied this previlege? Nor can it be maintained that both the first and the second knowledges together constitute a *Pramanya* and not either of them by itself. For it cannot be declared that the first knowledge contributes for half of the validity while the second knowledge supplies the other half. Because it is monstrous to hold that each of the Pramanas produce only a half knowledge of the whole *Pramana* while we actually see that a pramana gives us full knowledge of the object with which it s concerned. Therefore it must be admitted that the *validity* of every *Pramana* originates of itself at the outset. On this the *Buddhists* turn and retort thus:—

"स्वतःप्रामाण्यवादिनापि गुणवदिन्द्रियादिकारणिकैव प्रमाणोत्पत्तिरास्थेया, तद्यदि गुणाः प्रमाणोत्पत्तौ कारणं तदार्थनिश्चयाख्ये तत्कार्येऽपि तदधीनता युक्ता, तदा यत्तप्रामाण्याश्रयणात्"

The passage means:—"Even though you maintain स्वत: प्रामाण्य you have not improved the position of the science of *Pramana*. For your "*validity at the outset*" theory rests on the instruments of knowledge being pure or having merits in them as unless you will be miserably misled in regard to the existence of things. If you require, as has been just now shown, merits in the instruments employed to ascertain the real nature of an object, it logically follows that the determination of the object or अर्थ also brought to us by the instruments employed, depends upon the merits of the knowledge imparted to us by the *Pramana* which is the instrument used. For the knowledge is but the effect of the instrument employed and if you require that the instrument should have merits, why then reject it in the case of the effect alone? Either reject the whole question of merits from the beginning in which case the knowledge of the *mother-of-pearl* also will become real side by side with the knowledge of silver, or consistently accept it throughout." To this the *mimamsaka* replies:—

"प्रमाणोत्पत्तावपि न गुणा इत्येवापेक्ष्यन्ते, किं तु दोषनिराकरणौपयिकतया".

which means "although we admit that merits are necessary we accept it not because that it is essential to establish the *validity* of a *Pramana*, but because it is useful to be employed in destroying any faults that may be in the instrument of knowledge, for we have already shown that it is the faults that obstruct the *pramanya* or validity arising. And the moment they are destroyed by the merits in the source of the *Pramana*, it freely generates the *Bodha* or knowledge and it is that which makes us decide one way or the other. Therefore it is that we maintain that although no merits are brought to our notice about the source from which the

Sacred Vedas have sprung, we consider them as of absolute authority as no faults are shown to exist in the source. Moreover, continues the *mimamsakas*, let us assume for argument's sake that we require the assistance of merits to prove the genuinness of the source, but what has this to do in determining the final result which arises from the *Bodha* arising from the *Pramana*. The function of the *Pramana* is to generate knowledge. And this will be produced when the source is pure, and also when the source has no merits at all. An impure source will as much generate knowledge as a pure source does, the only difference being that the two knowledges will be different. And if we require merits to find out whether the source which generates the *Pramana* is genuine it does not necessarily follow that we should require it in determining the result also. Says the Mimamsakas :— "न हि घटः स्वोत्पत्तौ मृत्पिण्डदण्डादिकारणापेक्ष इति स्वकार्यजलाहरणेऽपि तदपेक्षेत्" which means that "simply because we employ certain instruments and clay in producing a jar it is not right to hold that such instruments are essential in employing jar to fetch water." Similarly though we may require the help of merits to determine the genuinness of the source, we do not require it to determine the final result as that is done by the *Bodha* imparted to us by the source. Once the genuinness is determined the source or cause is free to produce results which we should accept without any murmur. It is only when you require merits everywhere and always that there is an "अनवस्था" or "never-ending result." You require a merit for the source. And this merit must be proved to be genuine with the help of another merit and so on. Hence *Invalidity* arises from the source being proved to contain faults. Hence triumphantly conclude the *mimamsakas* thus :—

"तस्माद्बोधात्मकत्वेन प्राप्ता बुद्धेः प्रमाणता ।

अर्थान्यथात्वहेतूत्थदोषज्ञानादपोद्यते" इति ।

We shall continue the same subject next time.

The Voice of India.

The Hindu Inter-Caste Marriage Bill introduced by the Hon'ble Mr. V. J. Patel at a recent meeting of the Imperial Legislative Council is a highly controversial measure which, if passed, will stir up the Hindu society to its lowest depth. The text of the Bill runs as follows:—

"Whereas it is expedient to provide that marriages between Hindus of different castes are valid, it is hereby enacted as follows: (1) This Act may be called the Hindu Marriages Validity Act of 1918. (2) It extends to the whole of British India. No marriage among Hindus shall be invalid by reason that the parties thereto do not belong to the same caste, any customs or any interpretation of Hindu law to the contrary notwithstanding." Apart from the fact that the Bill seeks to strike at the root of the present Hindu society by introducing a system which might have been tolerated in an age when several forms of marriage were prevalent, the time chosen for bringing about the undesirable innovation is most inopportune. The unfortunate political controversy, in connection with the Reform Scheme that is going on in this country among the leaders of public opinion in different provinces is enough to make the angels weep, and the Hon'ble Mr. Surendra Nath Banerjea was perfectly right when he said, while protesting against the introduction of the Bill, that "we have enough troubles over the Reforms. Why throw another apple of discord in our midst?"

It is superfluous to say that a panic has been alredy created in orthodox Hindu society by the introduction of the Bill. The greatest enemies of the *Sanatana Dharma* and its time-honoured usages and customs are those who while professing to be Hindus, seek every opportunity to undermine them. Marriages between persons of different castes, even if they had existed in the *Pouranic* age, became obsolete centuries ago and this fact has been recognised over and over again by British Courts of Justice in the country. It has been repeatedly held by eminent judges that at the present day inter-caste marriage among the Hindus are not lawful and the issues of such marriages are not legitimate. This usage has been long and invariably acted upon in practice and has acquired legal force having been recognised by our Mahomedan and British rulers in their courts of law since time immemorial.

We cannot understand why our so called reformers should be so anxious to destroy the sanctity and purity of our religious

ceremonies when there are other ways to satisfy their whims and fancies. They are perfectly at liberty to marry *Dome* and *Mehter* women and have those marriages legalised under the Civil Marriage Act. Why should they insist on the Government which is pledged to religious neutrality, to interfere with our sacred rites and customs? Even a man in the street knows that a Hindu marriage is a sacrament and not a contract and the violation of any custom relating to it cannot but be considered by an orthodox Hindu as an outrage to his religion.

The world-devastating war has annihilated a considerable portion of male population of the civilised world and polygamy is being suggested in some quarters as an effective remedy to recoup man-power in society. Will the orthodox Christian people tolerate the idea even if it be beneficial for advancement of their nation? Such an Act would certainly go against the true spirit of Christianity. An Inter-caste marriage will be treated by the Hindu Society in the same way. To alter the marriage law of the Hindus would be doing a great violence to their religion and we have every reason to believe that the Government will never think to convulse the whole community by the adoption of an unfortunate and ill-conceived measure at the instance of persons who are cankers of our society and who have as little right to call themselves Hindus as those who have already openly seceded from us.

The Express.

Correspondence.

The views of contributors and correspondents do not necessarily reflect the policy of this Review—Ed.

Dewan Bahadur K. Krishnaswamy Rao, C.I.E., Madras writes as follows:—

In your able article on "Some Council Discussions," published on page 310, in the Hindu Message of the 5th Inst., you refer to the part I took in the controversy on the Basu's Bill, along with two other gentlemen named therein; and add "But a change has come over the opinions of some of these men." I wish to assure you that no change has come over the opinion I then held. I am as much opposed to Mr. Patel's New Bill, as I was against Mr. Basu's Bill.

I enclose herein a copy of the speech delivered by the late Rao Bahadur Professor M. Rangachariyar, at the protest meeting held in the Victoria Hall in Madras on the 2nd September 1911, against Mr. Basu's Bill. I beg to suggest that you may republish it in the Hindu Message. It will be of great help to those who are opposed to the present Bill.

Kali-Purusha.

अहं तु पृथिवीं यातो ज्ञात्वा सर्वोत्तमामिति ।
पुष्करं च प्रयागं च काशीं गोदावरीं तथा ॥
हरिक्षेत्रं कुरुक्षेत्रं श्रीरङ्गं सेतुबन्धनम् ।
एवमादिषु तीर्थेषु भ्रममाण इतस्ततः ॥
नापश्यं कुत्रचिच्छर्म मनस्सन्तोषकारकम् ।
कलिनाधर्ममित्रेण धरेयं बाधतेऽधुना ॥
* * *
कलिदावानलेनाद्य साधनं भस्मतां गतम् ॥

[Bhagavata Canto I.]

So said the Divine Sage Narada so far back as the infancy of Kali-Yuga and soon after the close of Sri Krishna's Avatar on Earth. What his opinion would be *now*, after more than five thousand years of Kali's havoc, is only too plain to need mention. Kali has had a free play and has achieved marvellous success; it is a matter for thought that he may not have work left to occupy the rest of his long life of thousands of years yet. He has made kali ([illegible]) of everything virtuous in man, rather 'the Hindu' and more specifically still in *the so-called Brahmin*, the unworthy relic of the stock of holy sages of ancient India.

"Vice is a monster of so frightful mien,
As, to be hated, needs but to be seen;
Yet seen too oft, familiar with her face,
We first endure, then pity, then embrace."—Pope.

Such has been the attitude of the *Western, mis-educated Hindu* and worst of all the *Jati-Brahmana* of the present day. It is no wonder then

"The Gods are just, and of our pleasant vices
Make instruments to plague us."—Shakespeare.

Kali, the embodiment of vices is seen busy, working day and night, with brilliant results at every stage, dislodging from the modern mis-educated Hindu mind all the Aryan virtuous instincts, ancient Aryan ideals of life and conduct enshrined in the immortal Scriptures and energetically practised by his ancestors until a little while ago. A little philosophy he has succeeded in learning, which, in other words, is a downright negation of whatever is his, pure and holy, simple and sublime, and a wholesale adoption and adulation of whatever is evil and vicious associated with modern civilisation. 'A little philosophy,' in the language of Bacon, 'inclineth a man's mind to atheism, but depth in philosophy bringeth men's minds about to religion.' Passing for a Hindu, for a Brahmin, atrocities are committed against the enjoined law and codes of the realm and the race, and the gospel of liberty and free thinking has become the sworn creed of these apostates and renegades. But what is liberty? What is freedom? Liberty is certainly not *license*, freedom is not *frenzy*.

'O' liberty! liberty! how many crimes are committed in they name.

'Obey, and you shall be free in time, but in minor things, as well as in greater, it is only right service which is perfect freedom'—*Ruskin.* Where then there is no tendency to obey, the freedom professed is lawlessness, and this lawlessness is now getting into a habit with the modern Hindu. He cares for no spiritual law, nor any social tenet of his Community. He recognises no leader, if indeed there be even a single leader. He has given full vent to the evil propensities of his mind. He is satisfied that he can set at nought the traditional habits and principles and practice of life as carved out for a Hindu by the deathless laws of his land. He thinks that, the moment he so feels, he can smoke cigars, cut and crop his hair in a ludicrous and outlandish fashion, present an ugly spectacle to the world of his self-shaven and half-shaven face and beard, whiskers and moustache, and do so many other un-Hindu and un-Brahminic acts his fantastic and fanciful instinct may dictate. The sight in Poona, for instance, where there is a large conglomeration of these unworthy and ignoble specimens of Hindu humanity, is certainly *one not for Gods to see.* They live a life of unbridled license. If they were already so, they are worse now. This habit of evil with the members of our society is doubtless fraught with danger to the Community as a whole; the crisis is growing imminent and calls for prompt action by the well-wishers and wise Elders of the Society wherever they may yet be found. For, in the words of the Poet,

"Ill habits gather by unseen degrees,
As brooks make rivers, rivers run to seas" and

"Small habits well pursued betimes
May reach the dignity of crimes."

This habit is very infectious, being an outcome of the universal epidemic of modern civilization. This latter is outgrowing its own bounds, it has caught within its meshes, not only the modern mis-educated Hindu, but the uneducated, the ill-educated and the innocent boor and rustic, the peasant and the pattadar, the servant and the cooly, equally with the master and employer; this epidemic has spread not only in the town and city, but has invaded the village and hamlet; This is prevalent not only in centres of business and politics, in offices and courts, in libraries and clubs, in hotels and messes, but is forcing its way in the home of the be-at-home idler and sit-and-chew-at-pial *grihastha* in far off villages. This epidemic of the evil side of Western Civilization is making victims everywhere in Hindu world, whether Ceylon or Poona, Bengal, or Benares also as I believe.

If a Brahmin Association can be formed with definite and well-laid-out effective plans to check this growing epidemic and prevent its having a further haul of victims innocent and impudent alike from amongst the Hindu Community; if it can devise ways and means whereby to curb the growth of ill-habits now taking deep roots with several of our men and women young, and old, that association must be hailed with delight as the ordainer of an agreeable order of things. It is no good to check merely the uncharitable and impudent effusions of ill-feeling and ill acts of the non-Brahmins, but the object must essentially be to rectify the so-called higher-caste members to such a degree and in such a manner as to create a feeling of respect and regard towards them in the minds of the other sections of the Hindu fold. Otherwise, the state of affairs will be somewhat of the household saying "My daughter is vicious, control your son."

Poona, J. S. R. SARMA.

A Query.

May I know whether there is anything in our Sastras to prevent a Brahmin who is supposed to be the student of one Veda from becoming the student of another Veda temporarily or permanently? I am a Yajur Vedin and follow Apastambasutra; but suppose I want to become a Sama Vedin, is there any set of ceremonies I should perform before such a change could be effected? Or in the same Veda itself is it open to me to become the follower of another Sutra say of Bodhayana or Satyashadha?

Again I am a Smarta (as conventionally known, as if the other Brahmins do not follow Smritis at all.) Is it open to me to become a Madhva or Vaishnava if I be convinced of the truths of Sri Ramanuja's or Madhva's philosophy? How is it there is no such conversions at all heard of in these days? Can it be that all of us are satisfied with the school of philosophy which is ours by birth and parentage and do not wish to change or is it due to the ignorance of most of the Brahmins or their absolute indifference to such matters as the performing of ceremonies as taught by the various Sutra-Karas and to the ultimate problems of life as discussed and propounded by the three great Teachers.

Will you or any of your numerous readers satisfy my curiosity as to whether there be any Tamil speaking Madhvas? Ramanuja claims adherents among the speakers of Tamil, Telugu and Kanarese and Sankara among the speakers of all the Dravidian languages (the Malayali Nambudiri is certainly not an Aiyangar or a Madhva if he be not a professed follower of Sankara, his own great kinsman.)

A SMARTA BRAHMIN,

[In reply to our correspondent, we beg to state that, according to our authorities a Brahmin must study his own *Sakha* of the Veda, and then he may study others. The injunction in the Sruti is, "स्वाध्यायोऽध्येतव्यः" "One's own Veda must be studied." This study is imposed as obligatory; the study of other Vedas is optional, but there is nothing to prevent any one from studying them under a Guru.

Our correspondent asks "suppose I want to become a Sama-Vedin?" Why should a person want to do so, when he is at liberty to study the Sama-Veda? Our authorities very properly assume that no one will take a particular course of action without a sufficient reason. Moreover the Sruti clearly holds that each Brahmin has a Veda for himself and must study it. All Vedas are equally authoritative, also, and all are accessible to all.

Our Social Problem and the Bhagavad Gita By K. S. Ramaswamy Sastri B.A., B.L.

Price per copy Annas 4 only,

For 50 copies only Rs. 10

As regards the Sutras, each has to act according to his Sutra, ordinarily. But there is nothing to prevent a person from changing his Sutra, if he is determined on it. The Sutras are all alike, more or less. Moreover, we can all of us receive enlightenment from all. Under these circumstances, there is hardly anything gained by a mere nominal change. When questions of Dharma turn up, we regard all the Sutras as equally authoritative, and consult all. Moreover, our idea that the Dharma-Sutras are complementary of each other, and not as in conflict in any matter.

As regards the several schools of the Vedanta, no conversions are made in these days and pundits of each school ordinarily give instruction only to those who are born in the sub-caste which has become appropriated to that school. But this restriction is observed only in regard to the Bhashyas of the Acharyas of the various schools. There are much expository and controversial literature belonging to each school which the pundits who maintain its tradition will teach to those of other schools or sub-castes. At the same time, if the heads of Mutts—especially, those belonging to the schools of Vedanta founded by Sri Ramanujacharya or Sri Madhvacharya—are approached, we think it might be possible to obtain a conversion. What the social consequences of such conversions will be cannot be known for certain, until one has tried and experienced what they are in practice.

There are many Telugu speaking Madhvas, but not, so far as we know Tamil speaking Madhvas. We know of families of Tamil Brahmins who have become Madhvas, but they have all changed their home language to Kanarese, as Kanarese was the language of their Acharya and is regarded by them as a sacred language which they must adopt as their own.—Ed. H. M.]

The Week.

The Indian Social Reformer writes:—We deeply regret the untimely death of Sir Ratan Tata, which was announced last week. A gentleman of broad outlook and catholic temperament, his large wealth was ungrudgingly devoted to the support of public movements covering a wide field. Indian philanthropy loses in him a discriminating judge, and judicious and liberal friend of many useful institutions.

* * *

The second Indian War loan has closed and so far as figures are available more than 46½ crores of Rupees have been subscribed. Bengal stands first with nearly 19½ crores, Bombay comes second with nearly 14 crores and we hope Madras is third with nearly 3¼ crores. India may well congratulate herself on this splendid response.

* * *

A Kief telegram states that the Czaritza and her four daughters were murdered in the neighbourhood of Ekaterinburg. Thus the Royal family of Russia has been completely blotted out of existence.

* * *

A Vienna official message says:—With a view to examining whether conditions are such as to make the inauguration of peace negotiations appear promising, the Austro-Hungarian Government to-day invited the belligerent Governments to confidential non-binding discussions at a neutral centre and addressed to them a note drawn up in this sense. A special note was also sent to the Holy See, bringing this action to its notice and appealing to the Pope's interest in peace.

* * *

Mahamahopadhyaya Pandit Aditya Ram Bhattacharya having resigned the Pro-Vice-Chancellorship of the Benares Hindu University and his resignation having been accepted by the Council of the University, the Vice-Chancellor has appointed Rai Bahadur Gyanendra Nath Chakravarti as Pro-Vice-Chancellor.

* * *

Mr. B. G. Tilak is proceeding to England this week in connection with his case against Sir Valentine Chirol. Mrs. Besant is going to Bombay to see him off.

* * *

The second Anniversary of the Sanatana Dharma Sabha of Trichinopoly was celebrated with great eclat last week. The Hon'ble Mr. K. V. Rangaswamy Aiyangar presided and Mr. A. V. Gopalachariar M.A., B.L., delivered a lecture on "the Future lives in the Past." When the lecture was over the President said a few words about the Sanatana Dharma and the necessity of our adhering to it. After some very interesting and instructive remarks made by Mr. K. S. Ramaswamy Sastrigal, B.A., B.L., the function came to a close. Such Sabhas should spring up all over the country to expound the truths of Sanatana Dharma and to keep its fire burning. They would form a network of organisations throughout the length and breadth of the land for the diffusion of a correct knowledge of the glories of our religion and philosophy.

Printed and Published by T. K. Balasubrahmanya Aiyar B.A. at the Sri Vani Vilas Press, Srirangam.